# National Socialism & Women

DER EINZIGE
APR 15, 2025

77 22 13 Share



A while back, I wrote a draft on the topics of women & feminism. I didn't end up finishing it because it wasn't long enough to justify an article, nor was there anything particularly special about what was said. Regardless, I now feel I can get that across better while also taking a look at the history of NS Germany itself. This article will cover three things: women & the NSDAP, women in post-war NS, as well as the ever divisive "Woman Question." For reasons I'll explain later, that last point will be more of a personal take than a look at established doctrine.

Skip to the bottom for the look at the woman question, if you don't want the history lesson.

I should first note that this isn't necessarily a look at women in Germany at the time. For the most part, women's station didn't differ much from their counterparts across Europe. Rather, this is a look at women & the actual NSDAP itself.

The best place to start is the organization that daughters of NS families would attend, later all German girls. This was the League of German Girls (BDM), which was part of the wider Hitlerjugend. The organization was founded at some point in the early years of the NSDAP, gaining its name & official integration with the Hitler Youth in the early 30's. The BDM had three phases, the first for younger girls (10-14), the main cohort (14-18), and a voluntary group for younger girls women up to 21.

The BDM had a virtually identical goal as the Hitler Youth, to train young people to be National Socialists. The primary difference is that much of BDM instruction was focused on domestic labor, as in homemaking & childcare. This shouldn't come as a surprise, this was the primary occupation for women across the world at this time. Most women were already going to be housewives at some point in their 20's, and learned to do so from their own parents. The BDM went out of its way to give training on this not because it was desperately needed, but instead for the eugenic & national health.

Although it's difficult to find relevant information, it seems the Party was concerned with infusing modern science of nutrition & physical health into the standard child care model that comes naturally. This was a major point for the NSDAP from the very start, increasing the overall fitness of the race by way of exercise & such. The BDM was an attempt to train future mothers to carry out this task, rather than expecting the school system to do it.

Aside from that, a considerable amount of time was spent on physical training & sports. Much like Sparta millennia prior, the NSDAP figured out that strong mothers create strong children & placed a strong emphasis on athleticism. As we will touch on later, this was also to prepare young women for tasks beyond normal wife duties. Naturally, this took a different form than the males of the Hitler Youth & included less 'combative' sports. The most notable is gymnastics, as well as various Olympic sports like javelin throwing.

The most important aspect of the Hitler Youth, for boys & girls, was education on the NS worldview. Younger members were given introductory work on the subject, such as the book *Faith & Folk*. Eventually, members were given fairly deep knowledge on the worldview, including in relevant philosophers, history, & even teachings on opposing worldviews like Marxism & Liberalism. It's unclear how fairly these ideologies were presented, but the purpose was to teach why National Socialism was superior. The history teaching is interesting as it not included the history of the NSDAP & Germany, but also world history & that of the local region/city. A major focus was ancient Greece, as Hitler was a strong grecophile. I want to emphasize all this because it was much more in-depth & enthusiastic than the typical civics classes one may (or may not) get in the modern West.

The NSDAP seemed to view women as the selective sex, as in they picked their partner. There is still a debate today in our circles over whether women's or men's mating selection is better, so it's interesting to note. As such, BDM members were taught to avoid race mixing. What many fail to realize is that when Hitler speaks of "race mixing" he isn't talking about Whites, Blacks or Asians. He's talking about Slavs & other ethnic groups near Germany. Due to this, the BDM taught members to identify racially valuable traits in a partner as to avoid mixing blood. This not only included basic phrenology but also certain eugenic traits to look out for, as much as can be expected of the layman anyway.

As a worker's movement, the entire Hitler Youth went out of its way to give opportunities to poor & rural members such as skiing trips, camping, & international travel. It also served as a recruiting pool for the SS after its vast expansion, generally taking the most veracious National Socialists that didn't want an administrative position in the NSDAP. For the BDM specifically, the top performers often married young SS officers once that time came.

The BDM, like the Hitler Youth, was not a Girl Scouts analogue but above all an ideological organization. This is important to note, because it was not just civic organization but a dedicated organ of the National Socialist party. As such, members of the BDM performed political activism throughout its existence. Looking back today, it's easy to only see the most prominent aspects of NS activism like SA street fighting but this was always a minority. The bulk of activism, as always, consisted of handing out pamphlets, putting up posters, and performing various demonstrations. Women's organizations played an important role in this, albeit behind the scenes, by creating the leaflets & such to be distributed. Compared to other parties of the time, women had a particular importance in these roles as men were often tied up in more combative roles.

Finally, I must remind you all that National Socialism is not traditionalist or conservative by any means. Once the BDM became compulsory for girls, there was the issue that many members would come from families that were not NatSocs, whether that be fairly apolitical ones or outright communists. Because of this, rebellion against parents was encouraged if necessary. A notable example from the official magazine was a story of a BDM girl disobeying her mother by refusing to be seen by a Jewish doctor. For the purposes of the NSDAP, members were to be Germans & National Socialists above all, regardless of the wishes of their parents.

In the same vein, the BDM was often considered to be sexually lax. Not in the manner of whorishness, but it was common for older BDM & Hitler Youth members to have children out of wedlock. Neither the Party nor the Hitler Youth itself saw much issue with this, as it contributed to the goal of increasing birthrates. It was also a part of NS policy, as far back as *Mein Kampf*, that an issue with fertility rates was that people were not able to marry & have kids at the biologically proper age. Of course, the NSDAP was generally unconcerned with any moral issues surrounding sex outside of marriage & saw it as little more than a symbolic institution.

I put these two at the end because they're generally more controversial among RW crowds, though true nonetheless. The only other legal organization for girls in Germany were Catholic Church groups, the members of which often faced bullying by male & female members of the Hitler Youth. This isn't strictly relevant to anything, but I found it funny.

This is an apt time to move away from the youth group & look at the National Socialist Women's League, which was the actual women's wing of the NSDAP itself for card carrying members. The NSWL became centralized in 1931, however this was a combination of several already existing women's organizations that had been around for years. For the most part, the NSWL performed the same function as the aforementioned youth group & spent its time conducting activism, generally the more creative types while male party members focused on political violence & such.

Interestingly, there was a notable difference between the official magazine of the NSWL (*NS-Frauen-Warte*) & that of the BDM (*Das deutsche Mädel*). The NSWL magazine was very typical for what one may expect from a women's magazine, especially of the time. It included articles concerning fashion, home economics, and general news. Along side this were topics more directly related to National Socialism such as party directives, speeches, & even ideological topics. A 1938 issue included an article titled "The Spirit of Race," which was a philosophical piece quoting Nietzsche on the topic of race. The youth magazine was different as it was far more ideological than the NSWL's, as in it was more for NatSocs than what one would expect to be "for girls." It's not very clear, but it's possible that party leadership wanted the next generation of women to be more ideologically inclined than what is typically expected from women. Otherwise, it may just be a greater effort to affect the youth during their impressionable years.

Naturally, the NSLW's primary audience was wives or young women soon to be married. The BDM was a separate cohort, who can be said to be more "free" in that they had time to work or conduct political activities before they would be expected to marry & take up domestic duties. Interestingly, the youth magazine went out of its way to portray role models that included pilots, authors, & other professional women beyond the typical housewife (not that this was discouraged). This became more pronounced as the Reich Labor Service was established. The RLS was voluntary for women, but still highly encouraged if young women were not soon to be married.

Both organizations played an important role during wartime. The primary focus was supporting the home front, gathering donations & assisting with logistics. Later, women also deployed alongside the military as part of the RLS & manned anti-air units. In the later days of the war, many women would join the civilian defense units (*Volksturm*) & were seen as an important element of the *Werwolf* insurgency plan.

Various NSWL & BDM magazine covers:

The following is an excerpt from *Women in the Struggle for Germany's Renewal* by Erna Günther, published in the NSWL magazine in 1934. I recommend reading the full article.

> *"Cold reason may hold party dogmas to be correct, but a worldview demands the whole person, reason and heart, faith and will. A woman does not first investigate the details, but rather is always ready to give her whole personality. Thus the women who encountered the National Socialist idea soon became its passionate supporters. They sensed that they would find in this idea of the state, built as it was on the most ancient possession of a people, on blood and soil, their natural role as the preservers of the race, as teachers of the youth. Once they were captured by this thought, they became active fighters in the battle of the past years."*

As for the post-war era, women's role declined to a degree under the American Nazi Party (I am not well versed on other countries' NS movements in this regard). This isn't to say that they were absent, several women helped out with the ANP's operations, but this was most often the spouses of official members. This is because the immediate movement of the 50's & early 60's was decidedly conservative in nature. This even included many of the organizations intellectuals as well. This means they had the standard idea of gender roles you would expect from 1950's era Right Wingers. This isn't an issue on its own, more of single topic showcasing the conservative problem of the time, as the movement was often driven more by resistance to the rising Civil Rights movement than actual ideology.

This shifted heavily during the late 60's, as the ANP collapsed & the social upheaval of the *counterculture* era arose. As I've written about before, this time gave birth to first revolutionary National Socialist movement - the National Socialist Liberation Front. During its founding congress, a relevant point in their *Strategy for Revolution* was "We recognize that women have played a vanguard role in most revolutionary efforts & involve them in every aspect of the NSLF." This was notable at the time as most radical RW organizations generally barred women from becoming members, scoffing at the idea. The NSLF, as a revolutionary organization, cared little for conservative notions that were popular at the time & only focused on their ideology & objective. An unknown woman took part in the 1975 gas attack on a theater showing a holocaust memorial movie.

This isn't exactly surprising, much of the 60's counterculture involved women resisting the attitude towards them that was common in the previous few decades. As much as feminism spread, it was equally common for non-feminist RWers to also reevaluate the values briefly held by the post-war US. This is especially unsurprising when you look into some of the shared roots between the hippies & Nazis, such as moving away from doctrinal Christianity (neopaganism, esotericism, 'New Age,' etc.) & the similarities between the pre-war *Wandervogel* movement & the hippies. A similar trend emerged with neofascist militants in Italy during the Years of Lead, who also had a number of female members.

Women would play a notable role in later revolutionary NS organizations such as the National Alliance. Interestingly, they seem to have been very prone to the Christian Identity movement of the 80's & 90's. I would assume it's because women have a long history & probably a natural inclination of being religious nuts.

---

Now that the history lesson is over, I feel I must give my thoughts on the state of modern women. This has been a contentious topic among the RW for the last decade or so, ever since "anti-feminism" became a core tenet online. Obviously, current society is very far from what could be considered normal even just a few decades ago. This leaves us to evaluate the situation without much historical precedent to go off of.

Firstly, I will outright state that any "gender war" discourse is both idiotic & useless. Any 'moral failings' of modern women is shared by modern men. No amount of OnlyFans whores or r/relationshipadvice posts changes the actual facts of the matter. The only thing it accomplishes is to divide us along superficial lines, which is why 'conservative' influences love to blame "liberal White women" for things that are generally the fault of non-Whites & their sympathizers.

The modern gender divide is overwhelmingly caused by the lack of socialization in the world, driven first by the spread of the internet during the 2010's & later by the COVID pandemic/lockdown. These events have led to a variety of societal issues, such as mass loneliness & a general disconnect from reality for many. This leads to people viewing reality based on social media, which is extremely far from the truth. A good example is people basing their worldview on exaggerated memes. Goes double for ones made by an ideological in group.

To set the stage, let's establish two historical facts. Firstly, a roughly equal amount of women & men voted for Hitler in 1933. By wars end, roughly 40% of card carrying members of the NSDAP were women. Secondly, women have a notable presence in various radical organizations. From the NSLF to the Weatherman Underground. Even more modern organizations like IronMarch & AntiFa have a notable amount of women present.

Why are these important? Because an often repeated line among RWers is that we need to repeal women's ability to vote. Another is that women are incapable of supporting ideological causes that are not supported by society at large because their feeble woman brains can't handle being beyond social consensus. Neither of these are accurate. You could revoke the 19th amendment right now & nothing would change because politics follows ethnic lines far closer than gender. Similarly, excluding competent women from radical organizations does nothing but lose potential members, which are always in short supply for obvious reasons.

The assumption that women are somehow "naturally left leaning" is counterintuitive because it's simply untrue, parroting it just leads us to chasing spooks instead of making real change. It's easy to say this in the modern day, where there's a decent ideology gap between the sexes, but if you follow the data further back than 20 years it becomes irrelevant.

Especially in regards to what is “natural.” We, as either NatSocs or a broader “far right,” cannot afford to waste time doing this. We must rationally evaluate our obstacles & take the necessary measures to evade them. It does us no good to chase ghosts.

A key issue I see constantly is that many can't figure out whether women have agency or not. As in, do they simply follow the popular consensus or are they rational creatures capable of making informed decisions of their own. People will say they do not, usually as a reason women shouldn't have political power, but treat every negative behavior as a personal failure. This leads to the issue of can we blame women for *anything* if they don't have agency? Nobody blames children for their actions, it's seen as a failure on the part of the parents. If women are completely devoid of agency then they are also devoid of personal responsibility, meaning it's ultimately men's fault anyway. Otherwise women would have identical ideological beliefs as their male counterparts.

Naturally, the truth is in the middle. Women are, in fact, rational creatures that can make their own decisions. The issue that many don't realize is that the bar for “rational creature” is extremely low. The vast majority of people, regardless of gender, do not have the mental faculties necessary to deeply understand topics like ideology or philosophy. Most do not understand even basic politics. The idea of universal suffrage is frankly absurd, there's a reason it's a purely modern phenomenon that likely won't see the end of the 21st century. This is important in gender discourse because most people will only interact with the average person of the opposite sex. The online community that talks about grandiose subjects is fairly small & does not represent society at large. Maybe 10% of men are both capable & interested in such matters, less for women as their IQ bell curve is much steeper.

The topic of sexual promiscuity is a common theme among critiques of women, a long standing one at that. This becomes more or less irrelevant when looking at the very modern nature of the current dating culture. As in, it's never really existed until the last few decades. This means it's unlikely to exist in a few more decades. If we look at the overall history of human mating, monogamy is the norm by far. Enough of a norm to be considered the natural state of humanity. Barring any dedicated effort to change human psychology at the biological level, theres no reason to think this will change. The modern dating situation, as a part of the issues of socialization, is just another aggravating factor towards social collapse.

The ‘modern’ situation of whores & such is really anything but. Prostitution has existed in basically every recorded civilization in history, even the most religious & socially conservative. At various times they've been seen as lowly criminals, victims of economic hardship, or religious figures. The number of prostitutes today, whether they're real prostitutes or internet whores, is likely no higher than has always been present in various societies. That is, a small minority that gets amplified today because of online advertising (usually by conservatives online, unwittingly). This begs the question of whether it's natural & unavoidable that a certain number of women will always end up in such a lifestyle. If the answer is yes, society will always have a demographic of promiscuous women, then it becomes less of a moral consideration & more of a question on how we make it less damaging to society.

I say this as a sort of reality check, a look at the facts over long periods of time rather than problems that have existed for less than a century. Women's primary role as mothers & housewives has been the norm for all of human history. This is true in the most misogynistic societies as well as those with more ‘liberated’ views of women, such as Sparta & ancient Germanic tribes. Feminism is a remarkably modern concept, that has only existed with any popularity for a few decades & is already facing massive backlash for its disastrous effects.

If we look at women in a natural state, whether in a vacuum or in a society left to develop without interference by grandiose ideologies, you will find mothers & domestic workers. Here & there, you may find spiritual shamans or oracles. This is a very good thing, because nature always wins in the end. Attempts to subvert the iron laws of nature lead to nothing but disaster & eventual realignment. In Hitler’s own words, “*When people attempt to rebel against the iron logic of Nature, they come into conflict with the very same principles to which they owe their existence as human beings. Their actions against Nature must lead to their own downfall.*”

Many do not understand what feminism actually is. This includes self-described *feminists* & *anti-feminists*. If you ask the former, it's about advocating for women. If you ask the latter, it's a misandrist outburst from unloved women. Neither are strictly true. If you actually read feminist literature, their theorists & philosophers, you will find that feminism is an outright denial of reality. The most important aspect of feminist ideology is that the traditional social arrangement of men & women is unnatural, and most outright deny any psychological difference between the sexes. Particularly radical theorists (especially transgenders) even deny physiological differences, claiming that men being stronger than women is purely due to social factors. Much of the same nonsense behind “anti-racism,” outright denying the most easily understood science in favor of blank slate theories of mind.

This is why mainstream feminism happily adopted the transgender movement, by the way.

The vast majority of people, when you lay this out for them, will know it's schizophrenic. Regardless, it was heavily forced into the modern culture throughout the 70's & 80's. While few are actually disconnected from reality enough to fully buy into the ideology, we are still left to deal with the downstream effects. The principle of which that men & women are seen as equal. Not as in equal value, but that they're fundamentally the same. The immediate effect of this was that women were now encouraged to enter the workforce & have careers instead of more natural roles. The long term effect is that modern youth often fail to understand the difference between the sexes.

An issue that is often brought up among the RW is that men today are essentially treated as defective women. Acting like any man naturally does is seen as a problem, this is an issue that begins in the earliest stages of development in schools & often homes. The flip side of this is that men often do the same, expecting women to behave as a man would & treating it as a moral failure when they don't. The most obvious example is in dating, where young men often have trouble because they treat women the same as a male friend. Also, the expectation that women are driven by the same standards of attraction as men (primarily physical).

This is essentially a process of *internalized male feminism*. They behave the same as feminists & use the same language, just gender swapped. Feminists claim that giving oral is *oppressive*, meninists claim that giving oral is *longhoused*. Feminists claim marriage is an institution to oppress women, meninists claim that it exists to tie men down. It's all the same, a rejection of reality. A rejection of the natural state of men & women that was crafted over millennia by the iron logic of nature. It goes without saying that all of these types, misandrists & misogynists, fail to understand the self-sacrificial nature of love & fail to comprehend that the the sexes are the way they are for a reason.

I should state that I don't believe this is anyone's fault, other than the ideologues that push such nonsense. This is simply a part of the prevailing ideology of the system, which our people were born & raised into. The disastrous effects of the death of real community in the last 15 years has only made this worse. Regardless, we must carry on. Lamenting social realities accomplishes nothing, we must adequately address them in order to achieve change.

An obstacle to this is that there is a real issue of misogyny. I use this term to mean "*dislike or hatred of women*," not whatever nonsense leftoids use it for. You can tell that many individuals on the RW don't actually derive their ill will for women from opposition to feminism or anything practical, they simply dislike women for some reason or another. The usual suspects are the MGTOW, incel, & "manosphere" crowds. Another common example is Christian types, á la Nick Fuentes, who take issue that with women not following their theological driven views of what women *should* be. Most of these people are some form of homosexual, just as much as anyone that's into 'femboys.' They're more attracted to male traits than female ones.

Unfortunately, the aforementioned crowds have become part of the general RW & thus reflect on the rest of us. As many of you are probably well aware by now, the Democratic Party has virtually no young men in its ranks. The rampant misandry on the left's part has driven them away, & they go out of their way to choose the most effeminate men possible to represent them. The issue is that the right could possibly face the same fate in the inverse. In fact, I've already seen it happen with both the Traditional Catholic movement a few years ago & the Orthodox movement that succeeded it (*note: for my Orthodox readers, this refers to the types who join for political reasons. Not a diss on the religion itself*). Both of which were devoid of any women, which has led to the issue of their adherents not having much of prospect for marriage. This is of particular importance since their whole shtick was "*get married & be trad.*"

This isn't unique to them of course, most of the old AltRight was also overwhelmingly male because it was relegated to niche internet communities. Places women generally aren't around. This was a natural development based on circumstance. Recently, this has shifted as the RW has taken to more accessible platforms like Twitter.

The question then is how do we adequately address women, both in ideological evangelizing & in our task to fix society when we win. The typical grievances from the RW is about sexual history & other "non-trad" behavior. Tattoos & piercings are another common example. The issue with the RW takes on these topics is that they're simply wrong. Random Twitter users will say that a woman with tattoos who wears revealing clothing will never find a husband & die alone, or something along those lines. In the real world, none of this matters. Women generally don't have any issue finding a partner because of these things. I'm not necessarily condoning this, just giving a reality check. It just comes across the same as a nagging teacher, without actually accomplishing anything.

As for evangelizing, you simply need to find already existing women who are decent role models & well versed in the worldview to ficus on women specifically. Men usually fail at truly understanding the feminine psyche, as do women the male psyche, so it's best to have women deal with their own. Such was the purpose of the NSWL. Specifically in regards to National Socialism, I have actually had a good experience with women in the movement. I would say the average female NatSoc is actually considerably better than the average male. This is purely selection bias of course, women generally aren't politically inclined so the few that are tend to be more dedicated, so to speak.

I have generally had decent success in spreading the good word. In my experience, women are far more prone to accepting proper *worldviews* than petty politics. Their historically recorded religious fanaticism is also evidence of this. My personal theory is that because women are less 'rational' they cannot rationalize half measures. Like how Alex Jones thinks everything is a government psyop, but not the holocaust. 9/11 was fake but everything about Hitler is actually true. Plenty of people, especially the center right types, rationalize themselves into cognitive dissonance. Such as the paradox of "Catholic National Socialists."

Women don't have this so once the guiding principles of an ideology is imbedded they simply follow it to its logical conclusion without trying to rationalize it. This is the true meaning of "vibes" is, the core principles behind a worldview that guide the praxis & other petty policies. George Orwell noted something similar in 1984, "*It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallowers of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy.*" This can also be compared to how women behaved in Puritan societies.

As for the question of fixing society, it must be a revolutionary shift in values. Contrary to what's commonly claimed, the amount of "childfree" people is a minority. By & large, humans are bound by their natural instincts. This is good for us, because it's easy to shift society to a state more in line with our innate characteristics than attempt to resist nature. The simple truth about the *modern woman* is that they're generally doing what they've been told to do for their entire lives. Regardless of what we would like to see, society at large encourages women to have independent careers & discourages starting a family young.

Fortunately, social engineering is remarkably simple for those with the power to carry it out. The most obvious solution is to foster a culture that encourages women to fulfill their traditional role. Make it socially desirable to be married with children in the same way that having a well paying job is today, as most people (particularly women) are driven by status. This is especially easy for NatSocs as it's in line with biology, like the rest of our worldview.

Economic restructuring also plays into this. As many have already pointed out, women's entrance into the workforce was not done organically for feminist reasons. Much like migration & offshoring, it was done by major business & financial figures in order to generate higher profits. Eventually, this lead us to our current situation where it's functionally impossible to support a family on a single income for the vast majority of people. By bringing industry back to our own country & getting rid of the slave labor force, it would be quite easy to effectively deal with a plethora of issues including allowing for natural family structures. Deliberate actions towards removing women from the labor force likely won't be strictly necessary, as they're far less likely to be interested in working in factories, farming, STEM, etc.

Much of the current female workforce is tied up in "bullshit jobs," which would likely disappear in reindustrialized economy. Women have always been found in the "service industry," especially before & after having kids. I doubt that would change in the future, same with other "women's work" like nursing.

I believe I've spoken of it before, but the modern institution of higher education is moronic. At best it's a fraud enterprise. Higher education being limited to those who actually belong in higher education will generally remove the majority of women from universities, as women are far less likely to have mental faculties significantly higher than average. Higher education has historically been limited to about 5% of the population, virtually no one in modern colleges should be there. It would be far more practical to replace secondary school with a more vocational focused education.

Which leads to my final point, which I have brought up several times before, which is that modern humans are not allowed to grow up. In today's society, it's not uncommon to see people claiming that adulthood doesn't start until the mid-20's or even 30's. Looking at historical anthropology & biology, this is comically false. Humans are designed to be 'adults' by their late teens. The vast majority of our ancestors were married with children by age 20. Peak fertility in women begins around 17 & starts declining during the late 20's. The same is true for men, shifting a few years later for the start & end date.

But what's more important than fertility is the sexual hormones, the various chemicals that make humans fall in love & have sex. These sorts of hormones are the reason high schoolers write poems about their lovers that they met 3 weeks ago while dating for people over 40 is basically a job interview. Like all things in the human body, the highly hormonal state of the mid teens to early twenties exists for a purpose. In purely biological terms, it exists for you to find a mate & reproduce. These hormones drop rapidly after the mid twenties, making it less likely to fall in love & have kids over time.

This also plays into the issue of “body count.” Our culture doesn't encourage young people to fall in love young, to the point that getting married at 22 today is often met with the same reactions as getting pregnant at 16 was a few decades ago. Unfortunately, expecting people at peak fertility to not have sex until the ‘socially acceptable’ age to settle down is a fool's gambit. This cascades into further issues like damage to individuals’ pair bonding ability.

Fortunately, this is a relatively easy fix. The solution was figured out be Hitler in 1925, & likely many other theorists before & after. That is, let people enter adulthood naturally. I don't just mean legal adulthood, but properly entering into a career, starting a family, etc. There's no reason for the vast majority of people to go to college, so that drops almost half a decade off the age to reach effective adulthood. Similarly, much of the primary/secondary school curriculum is simply useless. I won't go in depth on my thoughts about education, but the school system can easily be redesigned & allow individuals to graduate by the age 16. By this age, the majority of young people should be finding a career. It should be aggressively normalized via both ‘Sex Ed’ classes &/or Hitler Youth style organizations to find a spouse during this time.

This solves the body count/pair bonding issue by allowing individuals to mate in a way that is more natural, as we were designed to find a mate during puberty & begin child rearing soon after. The social program will revert to (every) previous society by emphasizing motherhood as the primary status symbol for women. Much of what is to be done to “fix” society is gender neutral, and relates directly to a more natural way of life - in line with the conditions that humans evolved to live within.

Above all, & to wrap up, women are the way they are for a reason. This includes the natural state of women & the unnatural nature of our current society. The iron laws of nature are not ours to judge, we must simply accept that the spiritual/natural forces that created us did so with a purpose, regardless of any difficulties in understanding it. The unnatural forces that gave rise to our present predicament, however, can easily be fixed once we are in control. Fortunately, nothing built against nature is bound to last & the unnatural conditions of modernity are the very things leading to its Collapse.

Hail Victory.


**Subscribe to ICØNØCLAST**

By Der Einzige · Launched a year ago

Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.

Type your email... Subscribe

By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.

77 Likes • 13 Restacks

77 22 13 Share

## Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...

Carfthy Apr 15

Liked by Der Einzige

I have been a woman in the far right for years and this is the best interpretation of the male and female perspectives in the natsoc movement I have ever seen. The truth that most people fail to see on the "extreme" ends of both sides of the political spectrum is that most people are normal. Not all women are whores, not all men are evil rapists. Go outside and talk to people and you will realize that the average man is kind with a natural instinct to protect, and most women are gentle with the natural instinct to nurture. I think a lot of women go the feminist route because of men saying things like "a woman should serve her husband and she should submit to him." It makes marriage sound like slavery. The truth of the matter is that being protected and loved by a person you care for, where you both rely on each other, that is the happiest relationship. But it's hard to go into the specifics of that relationship without the average woman feeling disgusted. I was apolitical when I was in middle school then started leaning right in high school, and even without grooming from the left, hearing that it is a woman's role in life is to raise babies and make the home just feels gross. This aversion to the traditional roles of a woman comes from both the left and the right. From the left, you hear "a woman who stays at home all day and does nothing but deal with snotty kids and make sure her husband is happy is a slave who wasted her potential in life" and from the right, you hear "a woman's only purpose is to make babies and serve her husband." They both make traditional wife-hood sound rotten. I DO want to have and raise happy, successful children, and I love taking care of the people I love. But I'm trapped in this cycle of fear. What if I do get married and the guys turns out to secretly be a deadbeat? What if we can't afford to live off one income so we're both working and I'm still expected to be the only one taking care of the kids and the house and the cooking? I have seen a lot of women, mostly women who aren't even political, share these fears, and I think they're incredibly common. I also agree with your

Expand full comment

LIKE (15) REPLY SHARE

5 replies by Der Einzige and others

Aodhan MacMhaolain Apr 15

Liked by Der Einzige

Good article, I do want to add that in the ancestral household cult, women have a high and mighty spot. When affirmed, they can achieve great things in their domain. Look at the volva, the holy women, or the fire tending virgins, or the women who tended to their kinsmens wounds after battle, or those who picked up javelin with Arminius. There are plenty of examples from the Celtic world as well.

None of that matters though, it's like talking about the reverse for modern men. Unless our natural domains are affirmed, and we understand our real identities based in reality, then we will struggle to find real solutions. This is why I have begun to embrace compartmentalization. There are specific domains for each gender, and each class of humans and they aren't all the same. Universal suffrage was a mistake.

LIKE (10) REPLY SHARE

**2 replies by Der Einzige and others**

**20 more comments...**

**Top** **Latest** **Discussions**

### Depopulation

This is another article taking aim at something that's generally associated with the left, and recontextualizing it.

SEP 26, 2024 • DER EINZIGE



### Zero Tolerance

Stop pretending enemies are friends.

AUG 1, 2024 • DER EINZIGE

### Winds of Change

America, & Europe, have moved massively to the Right.

MAR 2 • DER EINZIGE

**See all >**


**Discover more from ICØNØCLAST**

Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.

Enter your email...

**Subscribe**

By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.

Already have an account? Sign in